

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are all the claims pending in the application. New claims 19-22 have been added to further define the invention. Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Election/Restriction

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, and 18, have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner as being drawn to a non-elected species.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 10, 13, and 16, under §102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,925,964 to Kusase et al. (hereinafter Kusase). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because Kusase fails to disclose all the elements as set forth and arranged in the claims.

Claim 1 sets forth a rotor comprising: a pole core comprised of claw-shaped claw magnetic poles; and a magnet assembly composed of a magnet and a magnet-holding member for supporting the magnet on one of the claw magnetic poles so that the magnet is disposed on an inside diameter face of said one of said claw magnetic poles.

Because the magnet is mounted on an inside diameter face of the claw magnetic pole, the claw magnetic pole receives the centrifugal force, thus the magnet-holding member can be simpler and lighter than the holding member for fixing the magnet between the claw magnetic poles.¹ In other words, because the magnet is fitted on the inside diameter face of the claw magnetic pole, the claw magnetic pole directly receives the centrifugal force from the magnet when the rotor spins. Therefore, the magnet-holding member can be made lighter and, thereby, reduce the weight applied on the claw magnetic pole to thereby restrain deformation caused by centrifugal force.² Further, with the present arrangement, it is unnecessary to form flange portions on the claw magnetic pole, thereby simplifying the construction thereof.

¹ Specification at page 3, lines 21-26.

² Specification at page 9, lines 10-24.

In contrast to that set forth in claim 1, Kusase discloses a rotor wherein magnets 11 are disposed between claw poles 15, 16, so that flange portions 20 are necessary to hold the magnets in the radial direction. See, for example, Fig. 3, and: col. 1, lines 19-22; col. 2, lines 36-44; col. 3, lines 17-21, 27-28, and 59-61; col. 4, lines 1-4; col. 5, lines 57-60, 66-67; col. 7, lines 25-28; col. 8, lines 29-34; and col. 9, lines 34-38. The flange portions 20 are disposed adjacent to the outer diameter of the claw poles 15, 16; they are not on an inside diameter face thereof. Thus, magnets 11 are disposed between the claw poles 15, 16; they are not on an inside diameter face thereof. Instead, it is connecting parts 25 that are opposed to the inside diameter face of the claw poles 15, 16. See Fig. 3. Accordingly, Kusase fails to disclose a magnet-holding member for supporting a magnet on an inside diameter face of a claw magnetic pole, as set forth in claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, Kusase fails to anticipate claim 1. Likewise, this reference fails to anticipate dependent claims 4, 10, 13, and 16.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claim 7 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kusase in view of US Patent 6,172,441 to York et al. (hereinafter York). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the references fail to teach or suggest all the elements as set forth and arranged in the claim.

As noted above, Kusase fails to teach all the elements as set forth in claim 7, which includes all of the elements of claim 1 by virtue of its dependency. The Examiner relies on York as teaching a fixing part on the claw magnetic pole. But York fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies in Kusase. Accordingly, for the sake of argument alone, even assuming that one of ordinary skill in the art were motivated to combine Kusase and York as suggested by the Examiner, any such combination would still not include all of the elements as set forth in claim 7.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the


Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appl No. 10/665,116

Atty Dkt No. Q77541

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey A. Schmidt
Registration No. 41,574

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 8, 2004